

Remarks

Amendments to Claim 2

Claim 2 is amended to delete non-elected species, which are now recited in new claims 27 and 28. The central nervous system diseases recited in new claim 28 are supported on page 54 line 19 to page 55 line 26.

Claim 2 also is amended to recite a third step, “identifying said test compound as a potential therapeutic agent useful in the treatment of the cardiovascular disease.” The preamble of claim 2 supports this amendment. The amendment adds no new matter.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action requests a new abstract on a separate page, which is provided with this response. The Office Action also points out several trademarks in the specification. These have been capitalized and, where appropriate, accompanied by generic language.

Please withdraw the objections.

Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Fujishige *et al.*, *J. Biol. Chem.* 274, 18438-45, 1999. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A reference cited under 35 U.S.C. § 102 must expressly or inherently describe each element set forth in the rejected claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Fujishige does not expressly or inherently describe identifying a test compound as a potential therapeutic agent useful in the treatment of a

cardiovascular disease as recited in claim 2 as amended. Fujishige does not describe each element of claim 2 and therefore does not anticipate claim 2.

Please withdraw the rejection.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
/Lisa M. Hemmendinger/

Dated: December 7, 2006

By: _____
Lisa M. Hemmendinger
Reg. No. 42,653

Customer No. 22907